

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT TACOMA

8 JAMES J. O'HAGAN,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 GREGORY URSICH, et al.,

12 Defendants.

CASE NO. C12-5179BHS

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

13  
14 This matter comes before the Court on review of Plaintiff James J. O'Hagen's  
15 ("O'Hagen") complaint (Dkt. 1).

16 On March 1, 2012, O'Hagen filed a complaint against various defendants. *Id.* The  
17 majority of the defendants appear to be private parties, one defendant appears to be a state  
18 court judge, and one defendant is a federal bankruptcy judge. *Id.* O'Hagen asserts that  
19 the Court has jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; various sections of the federal criminal  
20 code, 18 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*; and 11 U.S.C. § 548. *Id.*


21 If the Court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the  
22 Court must dismiss the action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). The Court does not have  
23 jurisdiction over O'Hagen's civil suit under either the criminal codes or the bankruptcy  
24 code. With regard to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, it appears the only defendant acting under color  
25 of law is the state court judge. Judges, however, are entitled to absolute immunity.  
26 *Taggart v. State*, 118 Wn.2d 195, 203 (1992). Therefore, the Court finds that O'Hagen  
27  
28

1 has failed to show that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations in his  
2 complaint.

3 O'Hagen must show cause why this Court may have subject matter jurisdiction no  
4 later than March 24, 2012. Failure to respond will result in **DISMISSAL** of his  
5 complaint.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 DATED this 7th day of March, 2012.

8  
9   
10 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28